

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION - CINCINNATI

JAMES SULLIVAN,	:	Case No. 1:22-cv-763
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	Judge Matthew W. McFarland
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
HAMILTON COUNTY COMMON	:	
PLEAS COURT, et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

---

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

---

The Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Karen L. Litkovitz (Doc. 69), to whom this case is referred pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). Plaintiff timely filed Objections (Doc. 77) in accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).<sup>1</sup> Defendants timely responded to Plaintiff's objections. (See Doc. 79.) However, Plaintiff's objections are "vague, general, [and] conclusory" and, consequently, failed to "meet the requirement of specific objections[.]" *Cole v. Yukins*, 7 F. Appx. 354, 356 (6th Cir. 2001). Thus, such objections are "tantamount to a complete failure to object." *See id.*

Therefore, the Court **OVERRULES** Plaintiff's Objections (Doc. 70) and hereby **ADOPTS** said Report and Recommendation (Doc. 69) in its entirety. Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** the County Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 49).

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court notes that Plaintiff's Objections were due on December 9, 2023. Plaintiff filed the Objections on December 11, 2023. Despite the Objections being filed out of time, the Court considers the merits of the Objections and finds them to be vague, general, and conclusory. *See Cole*, 7 F. Appx. at 346.

Plaintiff's claims against the County Defendants are **DISMISSED** for the reasons explained in the Report and Recommendation. This matter is **TERMINATED** from the Court's docket.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

By: 

JUDGE MATTHEW W. McFARLAND